Amendments to the Drawings

Fig. 1 is amended herein to replace "view" with "view3" in the line corresponding to reference number **140**, thereby aligning the figure with its corresponding text on p. 16, line 3.

Fig. 4 is also amended with the same correction in the final <view ...> element of the <ALTlet> tag that begins at reference number **110**.

No new matter is introduced with these amendments, which are supported in the specification as originally filed.

REMARKS

The Drawings have been amended. Claims 1 - 3 have been amended. Claims 4 - 5 and 7 - 19 have been cancelled from the application without prejudice (and Claim 6 was previously cancelled from the application without prejudice). Claims 20 - 25 have been added. No new matter has been introduced with these amendments or added claims, all of which are supported in the specification as originally filed. Applicants are not conceding in this application that the claims that were amended and the claims that were cancelled are not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, as the claim amendments and cancellations are directed toward facilitating expeditious prosecution of the application and allowance of all remaining claims at an early date. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue the now-cancelled claims and other claims in one or more continuations and/or divisional patent applications. Claims 1 - 3 and 20 - 25 are now in the application.

I.   Proposed Replacement Drawings

Proposed replacement drawings are provided herewith for **Figs. 1** and **4**, as discussed above in "Amendments to the Drawings". No new matter has been introduced with these proposed replacement drawings.

II.   Rejections under 35 U. S. C. §103(a)

Paragraph 6 of the Office Action dated May 7, 2007 (hereinafter, "the Office Action") states that Claims 1 - 4, 6 - 12, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being

unpatentable over U. S. Patent 6,457,030 B1 to Adams et al. (hereinafter, "Adams") in view of

U. S. Patent 6,023,714 to Hill et al. (hereinafter, "Hill"). Paragraph 7 of the Office Action

states that Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Adams in

view of Hill and further in view of U. S. Patent 6,300,947 B1 to Kanevsky. Paragraph 8 of the

Office Action states that Claims 13 - 14, 16 - 17, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

as being unpatentable over Adams and Hill and further in view of U. S. Patent 6,966,034 B2 to

Narin. Paragraph 9 of the Office Action states that Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C.

§103(a) as being unpatentable over Adams, Hill, and Narin and further in view of U. S. Patent

6,226,642 B1 to Beranek. These rejections are respectfully traversed with regard to the claims

as currently presented.

Claim 1, as currently presented, specifies:

A computer-implemented method of selecting component-level views,
comprising steps of:
receiving, at a server-side device from a requester, a request for content;
locating a content file to provide the requested content, wherein:
the content file comprises a first portion of the requested content
and a template corresponding to a remaining portion of the requested content;
and
the template specifies, for a content component that forms the
remaining portion of the requested content, a plurality of alternative selectable
views of the content component, each of the alternative selectable views
comprising a corresponding value, and conditions for selecting each of the
alternative selectable views;
evaluating one or more factors to determine an evaluation result,
wherein the factors are determined from the conditions specified in the
template;
using the determined evaluation result to select a particular one of the
alternative selectable views specified in the template;
replacing the template, from the content file, with the value

corresponding to the selected particular one of the alternative selectable views, thereby specifying the value corresponding to the selected particular one of the alternative selectable views as the remaining portion of the requested content; and

returning the content file, as revised by the replacing step, from the server-side device to the requester for rendering. (emphasis added)

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references fail to teach, or suggest, (at least) the above-underlined limitations from independent Claim 1. Applicants find no teaching or suggestion in Adams, for example, of "a content file ... comprises a first portion of the requested content and a template corresponding to a remaining portion of the requested content; and the template specifies, for a content component that forms the remaining portion of the requested content, a plurality of alternative selectable views ..." (Claim 1, lines 4 - 12, emphasis added) wherein "the value corresponding to the selected particular one of the alternative selectable views" replaces the template (Claim 1, lines 17 - 18). Refer to source file 6' of **Fig. 5A**, which has no "template" as claimed by Applicants. Adams discusses replacing the syntax at reference number **30** with one of reference numbers **44a, 44b,** and **44c** of **Fig. 5B**, for example, as discussed in col. 10, lines 11 - 12, "Three alternative images **44a, 44b, 44c** [from file **40** of **FIG. 5B**] are available for replacing image **30** in the HTML file **6'** of **FIG. 5A**." However, the syntax at reference number **30** cannot be aligned to Applicants' claimed "template [that] *specifies* ... a plurality of alternative selectable views .." (Claim 1, lines 8 - 11, emphasis added, where lines 6 - 7 further specify that a content file comprises the template).

Furthermore, Applicants find no teaching, or suggestion, in Kanevsky (cited in the

Office Action with reference to Claim 5) of a "content file comprises ... a template ... [that] specifies ... a plurality of alternative selectable views of the content component ..." (Claim 1, lines 6 - 12). Kanevsky tests whether "<u>all</u> of the web page data" will fit on a display (col. 8, lines 35 - 38, emphasis added), rather than Applicants' claimed approach of "select[ing] <u>a particular one</u> of the alternative selectable views specified in the template" (Claim 1, lines 15 - 16) and then replacing the template with the corresponding value (Claim 1, lines 17 - 18). Kanevsky further states that "If the matching module **203** determines that the web page representation substantially matches the display size, i.e., the web page data ... <u>will fit</u> ... [then] the web page data is sent to the server ... to be forwarded to the client ..." (col. 8, lines 38 - 43, emphasis added) – in other words, the web page is not modified at the server – and "Otherwise [i.e., when the web page data will <u>not</u> "fit"], the alternative URL/CGI instructions **201a - 201d** are provided to a search module **205** ..." (col. 8, lines 44 - 45) that "can quickly compare the information in the respective special instructions [which may be associated with each of the alternative models, as stated in col. 8, lines 53 - 57] to the display mode message information [received from the client; see **103** of **Fig. 1**] and determine which, if any, model is the optimal model for the user's display screen" (col. 8, line 65 - col. 9, line 3). However, Applicants find no teaching, or any suggestion, of <u>a template that specifies these alternative URL/CGI instructions **201a - 201d** (and conditions for selecting each of these alternatives) in a content file</u>, in contrast to limitations specified on lines 6 - 12 of Applicants' Claim 1.

In contrast to limitations specified in Applicants' Claim 1, lines 17 - 20, Hill does not

teach, or suggest, "replacing the template, from the content file [where "the content file comprises ... the template ...", as specified on lines 6 - 7 of Claim 1, emphasis added], with the value corresponding to the selected particular one of the alternative selectable views [of a content component; see Claim 1, lines 9 - 10] ...". Instead, Hill describes formatting, or styling, the layout of document content by applying a style sheet. See, for example, lines 1 - 2 of Hill's Abstract, stating "Dynamically adapting the layout of a document ..." and lines 6 - 11 of Hill's Abstract, "... the layout generator selects a style sheet ... The style sheet assigns values to format properties ...". See also col. 6, lines 49 - 53, where Hill states

> A style sheet is a collection of style definitions which provides instructions for formatting a document. A style sheet does not contain any document content, only instructions for formatting document content. (emphasis added)

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that their independent Claim 1 is patentable over the cited references. Independent Claims 20 and 23 specify analogous limitations, and are therefore deemed patentable over the references as well. Dependent Claims 2 - 3, 21 - 22, and 24 - 25 are deemed patentable by virtue of (*inter alia*) the allowability of the independent claims from which they depend.

The Examiner is therefore respectfully requested to withdraw the §103 rejections.

III.   Conclusion

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the pending rejected claims, withdrawal of all presently outstanding rejections, and allowance of all remaining claims at an

early date.

Respectfully submitted,

/Marcia L. Doubet/ /#40,999/

Marcia L. Doubet
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 40,999

Customer Number for Correspondence: 43168
Phone: 407-343-7586
Fax: 407-343-7587

Attachment(s): Replacement Sheets (2)